

REMARKS

Claims 7, 12 to 19, 21 and 22 are in the case.

With this amendment, Claims 12 and 17 have been amended in a manner which is believed to better define over the prior art. Claim 20 has been cancelled from the application and minor editorial amendments made to Claims 19 and 22.

In greater detail, the rejection of Claim 12 in the Office Action of August 20, 2007 is respectfully traversed. Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,604,321 in view of Publication 2005/003396. The Examiner has noted that the '321 reference does not teach the use of a single ring centrally located of the medium retaining members. The Examiner has then alleged that the '396 reference discloses a medium retaining member that is centrally located to the ring (114 of Figure 4(d) where ring is 106). It is respectfully submitted that this interpretation does not correspond with the language of the Claim which states that the ring is centrally located with respect to the medium retaining members. Thus, the '396 reference cannot respond to this limitation.

To even further clarify and further define over the reference, Applicant has added language to Claim 12 stating that the medium retaining member extends beyond the ring on both sides thereof. This clearly brings the claim outside the scope of any teachings of the '396 reference.

Claims 13 to 16 are believed to be allowable for the reasons advanced regarding the allowability of Claim 12.

With respect to Claim 17, the Examiner has relied on the reference of Sparkes in rejecting the same under 35 U.S.C. 102. Claim 17 has now been amended to state that there are stationary liquid supply means for supplying liquid to the medium retaining members and with the liquid supply means being mounted in an upper quadrant of the ring and further stating that the liquid supply means are designed to supply a liquid to the apertures formed in the base.

The Sparkes publication does not disclose liquid supply means which are stationary. Rather, they move with the tube in which they are mounted. Furthermore, this reference cannot respond to the limitation of the liquid being supplied to an aperture formed in the base of the medium retaining members.

The arrangement for the supply of the liquid is important in that the present invention permits one to supply only the amount of liquid which will be utilized by the plant. This avoids the problem of an oversupply and having to collect the liquid which is not utilized by the plant. Firstly, if one collects the oversupply of liquid (including fertilizer) and recycles the same, contamination will occur within a very short period of time. Furthermore, the excess liquid substantially adds to the weight of the rotating portion of the apparatus and thus a larger motor is required.

The objection under 35 U.S.C. 112 to Claim 12 has been noted and correction has been made thereto.

It is now believed this application is in order for allowance and such action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully,



Eric Fincham
Reg. No. 28,201

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as Express Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop - Non-Fee Amendment - Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on Dec 19, 2007 Express Mail ED 428041788 US


Eric Fincham

Dec 19, 2007
Date